

new

Dale Marshall

ANNUAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM PROJECT

THE FLOW OF FEDERAL FUNDS



AN ASSESSMENT FOR
SAN FRANCISCO JUNE 1973

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

DEC 29 1980

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR and THE DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

calls for Clearinghouse

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

JUL 15 1973

THE FLOW OF
FEDERAL FUNDS

an assessment for
san francisco

a background report
prepared by the staff of the
Annual Development Program Project

a preliminary draft
June 15, 1973

revised draft
November 1, 1973

The preparation of this report was financed in part with a grant from the
U.S. Federal Regional Council, Region IX, San Francisco.

81 00970

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

JUL 15 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY

The University of California has received a grant from the
National Endowment for the Humanities for the

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| PREFACE | 1 |
| THE NEED FOR A CLEARINGHOUSE | 3 |
| AVAILABILITY OF DATA ON FEDERAL FUNDS | 4 |
| ASSESSMENT OF FEDERAL DATA | 5 |
| The Environmental Protection Agency | 8 |
| The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare | 11 |
| The Department of Housing and Urban Development | 17 |
| The Law Enforcement Administration | 21 |
| The Department of Labor | 24 |
| The Office of Economic Opportunity | 29 |
| The Department of Transportation | 31 |
| SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS | 35 |
| Local Cooperation | 35 |
| Federal Cooperation | 35 |
| Local Data Reporting | 36 |
| Local Data Needs | 36 |
| Pre-Application Review and Comment | 37 |



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C123307473>

This report was prepared for the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco pursuant to the contract between the Mayor, on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, and the U.S. Federal Regional Council, Region Nine, San Francisco, entered into July 14, 1972.

The report was prepared under the direction of the Director of Planning, with the advice and assistance of a technical advisory committee of City and County officials. The Technical Advisory Committee members are: Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning and Chairman; William Becker, Director, Human Rights Commission; Nathan B. Cooper, Controller; Charles Countee, Director, Model Cities Program; Francis J. Curry, M.D., Director of Public Health; George Grubb, Director of Budgets; Thomas J. Mellon, Chief Administrative Officer; Harvey Rose, Budget Analyst, Board of Supervisors; Robert L. Rumsey, Executive Director, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency; John H. Tolan, Jr., Deputy for Development.

This report was prepared by Charles Q. Forester, Project Manager, with assistance from John H. Anderson, Principal Consultant.

Technical assistance and special data for the report were provided by Karen S. Christensen, staff to the Federal Regional Council; Eunice Elton, Mayor's Manpower Representative; and Lawrence J. Simi, Mayor's Criminal Justice Council.

Cover design was prepared by Eda Kavin under the direction of Frank Hendricks of the Department of City Planning. Marge Hall of the Mayor's Office of Community Development had typing and clerical responsibilities for the production of the report.

P R E F A C E

One of the major recommendations of the Annual Development Program Project states that a clearinghouse be established in the Mayor's Office to oversee Federal and State grants. Such a clearinghouse would be designed to provide more effective coordination, improved planning and more effective utilization of available State and Federal funds in San Francisco. The recommendation further spells out the component parts of such a clearinghouse:

1. Pre-application review and comment by City officials, by non-City reviewing agencies, and concerned private and non-governmental groups and organizations, as appropriate.
2. Expedition of applications through processing and follow-through assistance until applications are acted upon by State and Federal authorities; and assistance in preparation and monitoring of Federal or State/City contracts.
3. Accumulation of data on Federal and State funding and analysis of local programming and funding requirements to support assisted projects.

The need for such a clearinghouse has become increasingly apparent during the past several years as Federal assistance has become more limited and as the Federal government moves toward placing more and more responsibility for programming local expenditures with local chief executives. One of

the key elements in a locality being able to solve its particular problems is knowing where available resources are and how they can best be applied to the problems at hand. A central clearinghouse serves this function, accululating data on the flow of federal funds to the locality. By knowing what kinds of assistance are being currently received by the City, the City can better anticipate what will be available in future years and where the gaps will appear.

This report addresses the specific question of data that is currently available to the City and describes the nature of Federal assistance presently coming to San Francisco.

methodology

It was decided at the outset that three sources of information would be used. The Federal Regional Council was asked to supply the most current data available on Federal grants in San Francisco from its seven member agencies.* Secondly, available A-95 and A-98** information, published by the State clearinghouse, also would be used. Finally, Bill Kennedy, a fiscal analyst on loan from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, in the Controller's Office would be asked to provide information from the City's records.

It was decided that the ADP staff would work on collecting the data from the beginning of January through the end of February. At that time we would simply stop. If we did not have sufficient information at that time, then we would know that in the future more time would be required to acquire sufficient information. And we would also know that the federal agencies had difficulties obtaining adequate data. This methodology was not followed as closely as originally planned, and certain allowances in time were made in the interest of better data.

The more academic aspects of the research for this report were de-emphasized in favor of the more applicable ones. The major purpose was to assess the City's needs for accurate data on the flow of federal funds to San Francisco. This report also describes and analyzes the kinds of data that would be available to a local clearinghouse and makes recommendations about ways in which a local clearinghouse could maintain data and fill present gaps in data.

*The Environmental Protection Agency, The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, The Law Enforcement Administration, the Department of Labor, The Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Transportation.

**The A-95 system informs local government of grants being applied for and requests their comments on the proposals. The A-98 system makes available information on which grant applications were funded.

THE NEED FOR
A
CLEARINGHOUSE

The need for a local clearinghouse to deal with state and federal funds has been discussed in the report on Recommendations. (Recommendations, Pp. 24-30.) Such a clearinghouse would be responsible for the following:

- a) maintaining accurate data on State and Federal funds
- b) coordinating current State and Federal grants
- c) reviewing and commenting on applications for State and Federal assistance
- d) assisting in developing more uniform application procedures consistent with local administrative practices

The maintenance of information is vital. The City needs to know where assistance is coming from and the amount of assistance received at any given time. It is also important to be able to project anticipated income from these same sources, based on previous experience. This kind of data would be collected and continuously updated by a local clearinghouse. Even with the advent of Special Revenue Sharing, or bloc grants, it is expected that the clearinghouse will deal not only with these coordinated grants but with the large number of categorical programs that are not proposed for inclusion in the various revenue sharing bills.

A clearinghouse would assist in coordinating State and Federal contracts. It would provide a central contact point in the City for up-to-date information and assistance. Coordinating does not mean exercising judgment on contract performance; no one will be looking over the shoulders of those responsible for the work of the contracts. It does mean making available administrative assistance to those who request it and maintaining data on the progress of contracts.

To the extent the City receives cooperation from Federal agencies a review and comment procedure will provide the City an opportunity to review and comment on applications for Federal and State assistance. This is not a veto power. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors already have a veto power in that they can refuse to authorize the ordinances that permit public agencies to seek funds. A review and comment procedure is designed to permit greater coordination among grants, more and better information, and a chance to better relate grant applications with the policies and objectives of the City.

Finally, a clearinghouse would assist in developing uniform procedures for grant applications. At the present time there are certain requirements that must be met in making applications. There is not, however, a procedure outlined that puts these requirements into logical order and permits the notification, in advance, of all City agencies that will eventually be involved in the process. In the development of an application, there is no

timetable that brings together the right people at the right times. There are no defined procedures for monitoring a contract once it has been **funded**. One of the first tasks of a clearinghouse will be to develop these procedures.

The clearinghouse would be composed of a technical staff and a policy committee. The committee would review grant applications for consistency with City policy and make recommendations to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The staff would provide technical assistance to City agencies and would maintain data on the flow of funds.

AVAILABILITY OF DATA ON FEDERAL FUNDS

At the present time there is no single source that supplies adequate information on state and federal funds to general purpose governments. There are a series of somewhat related programs that have been established to begin providing this kind of information. The A-95 and A-98 procedures were developed by the Office of Management and Budget to permit regional and state reviews of grant applications and the accumulation of data on the distribution of funds for some categorical assistance programs. These procedures and their shortcomings are described in the background report entitled "Inventory of Existing Municipal Management Mechanisms."

Occasionally federal agencies have provided funds to do ad hoc studies detailing the extent of federal expenditures in a given locality. Such a study was undertaken in 1968 for San Francisco by the then Bureau of the Budget. The study was never completed and preliminary reports of the findings are no longer available.

The federal Office of Economic Opportunity prepares an annual report on all federal expenditures by Congressional district. These reports were initiated originally to illustrate the extent of federal contributions to localities. Over time it has become a more comprehensive review of federal expenditures. The report, however, has several shortcomings as a source of information for a local clearinghouse. The data is very rough and is listed generally by federal program but not by individual grantee. No data on local shares, project length, or project description is provided. The data includes all federal expenditures, including salaries, overhead, and foreign assistance. There is no indication of those funds for which a city is prime contractor. Finally, a comparison of the OEO data and data otherwise available to the City indicates certain discrepancies. As the OEO information provides no details, it is impossible to determine its accuracy, compared with other records.

Individual federal and state agencies are another source of information. This has to be approached on a case by case basis, however, and generally a city has to have a good idea of the exact information it wants in advance of requesting it. Individual federal and state agencies have not made a practice of telling localities how much they are allocating to them.

Some summary information has been available on request, and with "Annual Arrangements" the Department of Housing and Urban Development attempted to plan with cities for an entire fiscal year's allocations at one time. To the extent that federal agencies are aware of the need to supply localities with information, they generally feel that their participation in the A-98 process fulfills their responsibilities. In certain instances where a federal agency has funded a local program staff to review programs, such as the Criminal Justice Council, there has been a more direct and continuous flow of information on funds from that agency.

Finally, cities' own fiscal records provide information on federal and state assistance. This data is the most specific, and depending upon local accounting procedures, generally can be isolated easily and readily updated. There are certain very real problems with relying upon this kind of information. The data is restricted to those programs for which the City is prime contractor. It does not include programs administered by agencies such as redevelopment, housing authorities, or school districts. It does not include programs administered by non-public agencies. In many instances some local activities are the responsibility of the county. For San Francisco this is no problem; for all other municipalities in California it is a very real problem. It is usually difficult for a local government to have continuous access to a county's records; it is difficult to determine the local share of county-wide operations. Localities can seldom have an effective review and comment on county-run programs. Local records therefore lack sufficient breadth for the kinds of information required by a clearinghouse.

A Chief Executive Review and Comment (CERC) procedure was established by HUD as a part of the Model Cities program in 20 selected cities. It is the first major attempt to begin supplying localities with accurate, up-to-date information on certain federal programs. The initial experiences of this experiment in cities like San Jose have been encouraging and efforts are being made to broaden the scope of CERC to include all federal categorical programs. There are presently no additional HUD funds to expand CERC to other cities. But until this program or one based on the experiences of this program is made available, local government will have to proceed on a piecemeal basis. Cooperation from federal and state agencies will be essential.

ASSESSMENT OF FEDERAL DATA

San Francisco decided to approach the specific issue of data collection through the Federal Regional Council, and in December 1972 asked the Council to provide the City information on all programs that Council agencies were funding in San Francisco. It was hoped that the federal agencies would be able to provide a fair amount of data on each project and that it could be provided in a consistent format. There was particular interest in trying to determine the exact amount of federal assistance for the previous fiscal year (FY 1972); it was expected that records for that year would be complete.

The Federal Regional Council requested its member agencies to provide the data on their programs. The Council, in turn, passed copies of the data on to the City.

It soon became apparent that there would be very real problems coordinating even gross data for one fiscal year. Each federal agency's data had very real limitations and there was little consistency among them. Some of the general problems faced by the City in evaluating and analyzing the data are listed below.

lack of uniformity

There is almost no uniformity in the data provided to the City via the Federal Regional Council. As noted in Chart "A" on Page 7, no agency provided all the information we initially felt would be necessary for a clearinghouse. Few agencies provided substantial amounts of the information.

payment variables

Different federal programs operate differently -- some permit advances, others reimburse actual expenditures. Different federal agencies monitor expenditures differently which also affects a recipient agency's ability to utilize monies once a contract has been approved. There is no simple answer to this problem.

availability

Substantial data on federal assistance is not generally available to local government. The FRC provided data to San Francisco in response to a request. Updating the information and correcting it had to be done on an agency by agency basis. There was no single reference point although FRC staff was helpful as an intermediary. With the exception of HEW there was no data available in a variety of formats. HEW was able to assemble its data by program as well as by sponsor for given geographical areas. At the present time local government must rely on the information supplied by the A-95 and A-98 systems through state clearinghouses.

different timetables

As anticipated, there was trouble in assembling data because of the nature of the grants themselves. Some are made on a fiscal year basis and tend to be spent entirely during that fiscal year. In the case of many transportation and community development grants, however, awards are made in one fiscal year and are spent in uneven patterns over several years. FRC information indicated only the amount of the original award and subsequent amendments to it. No indication of the unspent or uncommitted funds for the programs was provided; little delineation of the amount spent in a given fiscal year was available.

CHART A

Information Required by a Clearinghouse

(Note: These categories are described on Pp. 34-35)

| Federal Departments ¹ | Description | Funding Agency (within Dept) | Program | Applicant | Effective Date | Concluding Date | Federal Share | State Share | Local Share | Current Status |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| DHEW | | X | X | X | | | X | | | |
| LEA | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | |
| DOT | X | X | X | X | X | | X | | | X |
| HUD ² | X | X | X | X | X | | X | | | X |
| DOL | | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | |
| OEO | X | X | | X | X | X | X | | | |
| EPA | | X | | X | | | X | | | |

¹Federal agencies

DHEW - Health, Education, & Welfare
 LEA - Law Enforcement Assistance
 DOT - Department of Transportation
 HUD - Housing and Urban Development
 DOL - Department of Labor
 OEO - Office of Economic Opportunity
 EPA - Environmental Protection Agency

²Does not include information on airports

conclusions

To pull together the kind of information that would be most useful would require a full time staff operation concentrating on existing programs and new ones as they pass through the local clearinghouse. To pursue past funding would be difficult as the data is extremely difficult to assemble, and the results may not be of much value due to major shifts in federal programs such as revenue sharing, "freezes", etc. The most realistic approach to dealing with the Federal Regional Council's data is to begin with present information and treat each federal agency on its own terms for the time being and to suggest ways in which their data can be made more useful in the future, once a clearinghouse is operational.

What follows is a presentation of the data provided to San Francisco by the member agencies of the Federal Regional Council. The agencies are listed in alphabetical order, each section containing an analysis of the data received and recommended actions to improve the quality and flow of additional information from that agency over time.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) provided the least amount of information to the City via the Federal Regional Council. As indicated in Chart B on Page 10, their information listed the applicant agency, a project description, and estimated eligible costs for FY 1973. The EPA listed those projects of highest priority, but final approval and funding had not yet occurred. An update of that information was requested, along with a request for grants awarded in FY 1972.

The data is of limited value. The projects listed are not assured of funding. No data on previous commitments being continued in San Francisco was provided, nor were dates provided for the FY 1973 projects. The EPA listed sponsoring agencies such as "Richmond-Sunset" rather than the actual City agency. No project descriptions were provided, nor was local share information.

It is assumed that much of EPA's funding goes for capital improvements. As such, commitments will stretch over several years. Data on previous commitments still being expended consequently would be useful as would project dates for new commitments.

Recommended Actions for Clearinghouse:

1. Better contact needs to be established with the Environmental Protection Agency. Procedures for a closer working relationship between the EPA and the City should be discussed. Such discussions should involve not only the City's Departments of Public Works and City Planning but also relevant regional organizations that review EPA projects and set environmental quality standards.

2. More information on existing EPA commitments in San Francisco and more concrete information on FY 1973 grants should be obtained.

3. The potential for a local review and comment procedure should be discussed directly with the EPA. It may be possible for EPA to expand its A-95 review and comments procedures to include all EPA activities. This would obviate the need to construct a whole new process but would permit the review of all EPA programs.

CHART B

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION PROJECTS IN SAN FRANCISCO

Fiscal Year 1973*

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| SF Sheriff, Co Jail #2 | \$ 330,000 |
| Juvenile Court | 70,000 |
| DPW-Sanitation (Rich-Sunset) | 6,500,000 |
| " " " " | 9,000,000 |
| " " (SE) | 33,500,000 |
| " " " " | 27,000,000 |
| TOTAL | \$76,400,000 |

*The above represents a complete list, according to EPA, of all projected programs in SF for this year. They are ranked as highest priority, but are under consideration. They had not yet been approved and funded.

The EPA has not provided sufficient information to know what previous commitments are still to be continued in SF, nor did they provide dates on the projects listed above.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW)

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) provided the City with a substantial amount of information on local programs and indicated a great willingness to assist in this project. HEW responded immediately to the City's request to the Federal Regional Council and provided HEW data as well as copies of the State Clearinghouse's reports which cover all federal programs in the A-98 process. The most useful information was contained in the HEW annual report on expenditures for the region. This provided information on federal program, federal funding agency, prime contractor, and the federal grant. All information, however, was limited to FY 1972.

HEW appears to have a reasonably sophisticated computer system and their data can be assembled in a variety of ways, depending upon ones need. Data can be summarized by program, by sponsor, by jurisdiction, etc. This capability is helpful to local governments in analyzing HEW funding commitments. No project descriptions were available, nor were project dates. No indication of local and/or state shares was given.

There are several problems with utilizing this HEW information. The first problem is its availability. Much information is not available until six months after the close of the fiscal year. Other HEW sources, such as a quarterly computer run do provide more up-to-date information but are not generally available to cities.

A second problem is the sheer volume of categorical programs. HEW is composed of seven agencies, each of which has a distinct identity and is accustomed to a fair degree of autonomy. Only recently has an effort been made to coordinate these agencies within a common HEW framework. Increasing the quantity and speed of information is therefore a major administrative problem.

Thirdly, most HEW programs go through the State and are controlled by state plans and/or state formula allocations. These allocations are normally made to counties. (This presents no problem to San Francisco but does to all other jurisdictions in California.) Because of the state role, the HEW regional administrators are dependent upon state reporting to maintain accurate information on HEW expenditures and commitments. This, of course, delays any reporting by HEW to localities.

Finally, the largest HEW programs distribute money on the basis of either subventions or individual payments. Public assistance funds come to counties as subventions, that is, the amount of money allocated is dependent upon the size of the local caseload. Social Security payments are made directly to individuals and do not pass through a local agency. Because of the nature of these programs and their funding patterns, it is difficult to maintain data on them in the same manner as other programs.

Recommended Actions for Clearinghouse:

1. At the present time HEW is initiating a system of Regional Director Review and Sign-off. This system permits the Regional Director's review of proposed projects funded under 121 programs. The Regional Director is given discretion in seeking comments on the proposals, and it is anticipated that local chief executives would play a key role in the reviews. San Francisco should develop procedures for participating in this system as a beginning step toward a more complete review and comment procedure.
2. Continuous liaison with the Regional Director's Office of HEW should be maintained to develop a better working relationship. Regular updates of HEW information should be requested by the City, and both HEW and the City should keep each other posted on changing management procedures.
3. Greater coordination among local agencies should be encouraged. Meetings among the Department of Public Health, the Department of Social Services, the Unified School District, and other relevant agencies should be held to determine the potential for a system for programming community services.
4. More information on the state's role is needed. More effort needs to be devoted to spelling out allocation formulas and guidelines of state agencies. A closer working relationship between the Mayor's Office and the State in this regard should be sought.

CHART C

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS IN SAN FRANCISCO

Fiscal Year 1972

San Francisco County -- Estimated Pass-through Allocations

| | | |
|--|------------|---------------|
| California State Commission on Aging | \$488 | |
| California State Department of Health | 30,329 | |
| California State Department of Public Health and Welfare | 308,180 | |
| California State Department of Rehabilitation | 1,946,374 | |
| California State Department of Social Welfare | 86,903,704 | |
| California Older Americans Act | 85,533 | |
| Department of Education | 4,731,835 | |
| Disabled Beneficiaries and/or Dependents | 140,927 | |
| Disabled Coal Miners and/or Dependents | 5,235 | |
| Enrollee or Suppliers of Services | 23,402,983 | |
| Institute for Social Concerns | 89,795 | |
| Providers of Services or Intermediaries | 42,743,019 | |
| SAFA Funds to School Boards | 1,836,309 | |
| Survivors, Retired Beneficiaries or Dependents | 1,879,408 | |
| sub-total | | \$164,104,119 |

San Francisco

| | |
|---|------------|
| American Marketing School | \$49,484 |
| American Public Health Association | 51,467 |
| American Society of Internal Medicine | 61,636 |
| Arequipa Foundation | 51,811 |
| Bank of America | 981,386 |
| Bay Area Education TV Association | 316,334 |
| California State Coordinating Council on Higher Education | 277,619 |
| California Call to Conscience | 30,000 |
| California College of Podiatric Medicine | 528,293 |
| California Dental Association | 8,533 |
| California Medical Education and Research Foundation | 14,508,068 |

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS IN SAN FRANCISCO

San Francisco (Cont.)

| | |
|---|------------|
| California Podiatry College | 22,074 |
| California Schools of Professional Psychology | 34,996 |
| Chevron Employees Credit Union | 3,313 |
| Chinatown-North Beach Health Center Planning Development Corp | 110,032 |
| Childrens Hospital | 21,750 |
| Chinese for Affirmative Action | 50,000 |
| Christian Welfare Society | 13,444 |
| City College of San Francisco | 906,811 |
| Control Data Institute | 11,610 |
| Crocker National Bank | 165,882 |
| Direct Program Operation | 1,521,152 |
| Disabled Beneficiaries and/or Dependents | 13,125,481 |
| Disabled Coal Miners and/or Dependents | 71,193 |
| Donald R. Wesson, Associates | 22,000 |
| Dow Chemical Company | 183,489 |
| Economic Opportunity Council of SF | 813,570 |
| Education Center for Chinese | 129,989 |
| Far West Laboratory | 2,570,000 |
| First Western Bank & Trust | 15,950 |
| Friendship House of Christian Reformed Church | 93,750 |
| Goat Hill, Inc | |
| Golden Gate College | 233,604 |
| Healds Business College | 259,803 |
| Human Rights Commission | 39,950 |
| Hunters Point-Bayview Community Health Service | 133,966 |
| Institute of Medical Sciences | 171,966 |
| Japanese Community Youth Council Inc | 53,744 |
| John Hale Medical Society | 1,536,414 |
| Kaiser Foundation | 8,895 |
| Kimochi Inc | 48,575 |
| Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute | 726,108 |
| League of United Latin American Citizens | 30,000 |
| Liberty National Bank | 4,132 |
| Lincoln University | 10,814 |
| McCauley Neuropsychiatric Institute Medical Center | 36,540 |
| Mission Neighborhood Health Center | 48,097 |
| Mission Rebels in Action Inc | 17,629 |
| Morris Plan of California | 260,862 |
| Mt. Zion Hospital | 58,675 |
| | 1,102,483 |

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS IN SAN FRANCISCO

San Francisco (Cont.)

| | |
|---|-------------|
| NAACP Local Branch | 60,000 |
| Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse | |
| Review Committee | 122,900 |
| New Society Center Inc | 1,806 |
| Office of Education | 331,064 |
| Organization for Business Econ & Community Advancement Inc | 168,131 |
| Pacific Medical Center | 57,620 |
| Parents for Community Schools | 12,520 |
| Payne Maxie Consultants | 149,060 |
| Pearl Harbor Federal Credit Union | 9,225 |
| Plan of Action for Challenging Times | 59,463 |
| Presbyterian Hospital of Pacific | 38,199 |
| Recreation Center for the Handicapped | 160,954 |
| Regents of the University of California | 7,108,567 |
| Regents of the University of California | 682,398 |
| St. John Evang. Episcopal Church | 12,300 |
| SF Art Institute College | 11,889 |
| SF Bay Area Health Assoc | 260,000 |
| SF City & County Health Dept | 1,265,207 |
| SF City & County | 495,008 |
| SF College for Women | 120,503 |
| SF Conservatory of Music | 531,348 |
| SF Consortium | 45,168 |
| SF Department of Public Health | 2,046,585 |
| SF Firemen Credit Union | 1,849 |
| SF Friends of Psychiatric Research and Training | 441,634 |
| SF Psychoanalytic Institute | 8,489 |
| SF Society Health Plan Inc | 255,093 |
| SF State College | 3,667,567 |
| SF State Hospital | 21,803 |
| SF Unified School District | 1,917,396 |
| Scientific Analysis Corp | 352,762 |
| Simpson Bible College | 71,875 |
| SPEAK | 3,200 |
| St. Josephs Hospital | 25,000 |
| St. Josephs School of Nursing | 39,301 |
| St. Lukes Hospital | 258,000 |
| St. Lukes School of Nursing | 52,863 |
| St. Marys Hospital | 98,876 |
| Survivors, Retired Beneficiaries of Dependents | 163,925,875 |
| Sussna Dr Frances | 2,700 |
| Undistributed Grants - Nursing Scholarships | 4,724 |

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS IN SAN FRANCISCO

San Francisco (Cont.)

| | | |
|--|-----------|---------------|
| United California Bank | 5,450 | |
| Univ of California | 28,511 | |
| Univ of California, Medical Center | 2,651,079 | |
| Univ of California, Hastings College of Law | 419,789 | |
| Univ of San Francisco | 1,077,770 | |
| Wells Fargo Bank | 579,291 | |
| Westside Community Mental Health Center | 1,222,779 | |
| sub-total | | \$237,458,744 |
| TOTAL | | \$401,562,863 |

Summary of Community Service Programs, by Agency

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Food and Drug Administration | \$ 1,521,152 |
| Health Services and Mental Health Administration | 27,178,507 |
| National Institute of Health | 9,854,734 |
| Office of Education | 21,871,192 |
| Office of the Secretary | 813,570 |
| Social and Rehabilitation Service | 90,029,587 |
| Special Institutions | -0- |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$401,562,863 |

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provided the City with information on HUD programs in San Francisco that had been compiled in early 1972 as a part of another project. The data provided information on all HUD allocations to the City since the inception of the various programs now administered by HUD. Subsequently the staff requested and received a copy of the HUD "Program Statistics" for San Francisco, dated February 15, 1973. In May a further update of this information plus some breakdown of housing expenditures was requested and received.

For a variety of reasons the data made available to the City was incomplete for the purposes of this project. This is partially due to the nature of many HUD programs. Urban Renewal, for example, is a process requiring a great many years. These grants are generally made at one time for the entire project cost. Actual costs are reimbursed from this allocation; the entire amount is not immediately transferred to City accounts. the HUD information did not break down the original grants into monies actually spent, monies encumbered, or monies still unspent. There was no way of determining the annual flow of HUD assistance to urban renewal projects, except the Neighborhood Development Program (NDP) projects which are funded on an annual basis.

A second problem lies with data on housing assistance. There are a variety of programs -- Public Housing, 236 moderate-income rental housing, Rent Supplements, etc. -- none of which is financed in a way that makes annual accounting easy. For example, most data on 236 housing indicates mortgage amount or total development cost. HUD's San Francisco Area Office did finally work out annual subsidy figures for this information in response to a specific request from the Federal Regional Council. The information that HUD prepared on housing allocations was based on cumulative costs to date. More information on the methodology used in this process would be helpful to the City for the purposes of maintaining its own information over time.

Another problem exists in the money allocated for the Federally Assisted Code Enforcement Program (FACE). The HUD data did not list expenditures by project area; this information may only be available on City records. Secondly, the HUD data did not discriminate among Section 117, Section 115, and Section 312 money,* rather a lump sum amount was specified. Related to this was the lack of information on categories of disbursements -- how much went to banks for interest reduction, how many direct grants were made to individuals, etc.

Finally, there is the problem of non-conformity in how the funds are disbursed. As many HUD programs reimburse actual expenditures, data on

*Section 117 money is used for the administrative costs of the FACE program. Section 115 money is rehabilitation grants given to property owners meeting certain income requirements. Both these monies are received by the City. Section 312 money is for low-interest rehabilitation loans to homeowners.

exact disbursements is not available immediately but must await the local request for it. Programs such as urban renewal also require substantial advance commitments or encumbrances of funds. It is difficult to place these within a framework of an annual flow of funds.

Recommended Actions for Clearinghouse

1. The Office of Community Development (O/CD) has been established in the Mayor's Office. This operation is already providing a focus for HUD programs in the City and is likely to play an increasingly important role in the future. The O/CD is presently compiling more complete statistics on HUD expenditures within San Francisco. The clearinghouse should rely upon the information in this report and the more specific information prepared by the O/CD. Because of the wide variety of HUD programs, each with somewhat unique accounting procedures, the O/CD will be required to work closely with local agencies to get the best information from their records.

2. HUD should be requested to develop a uniform reporting procedure for notifying local governments of HUD expenditures. To assist HUD in this project, the City should indicate to them the kinds of data it would like to have. The data in Chart A on Page 7 of this report illustrates the kind of data that would be required. The City should further request that HUD make this information available on some regular basis.

3. HUD should be requested to participate in a local review and comment system. As HUD is nationally responsible for the Chief Executive Review and Comment (CERC) program, it may be possible for HUD to provide special assistance to San Francisco in defining a local program.

4. Copies of existing documents that summarize current HUD programs in San Francisco should be collected from the various local agencies and placed in a central file of information on other federally-assisted projects. Data on the status of current projects similarly should be collected in a central place. This information should be continuously updated by the clearinghouse.

CHART D

SUMMARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN SAN FRANCISCO

Fiscal Year 1973

(All grants are estimates)

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING ASSISTANCE

1. 701 Planning Assistance

| | |
|--|-----------|
| City & County of S.F., Office of the Mayor/Department of City Planning | \$250,000 |
|--|-----------|

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

| | |
|-----------------|-------------|
| 1. Model Cities | \$3,923,100 |
|-----------------|-------------|

2. Conventional Urban Renewal

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Diamond Heights | 475,000 |
| Western Addition A-1 | -0- |
| Embarcadero/Lower Market | -0- |
| Western Addition A-2 | 6,262,000 |
| Yerba Buena Center | 3,897,000 |
| India Basin Industrial Park | -0- |

3. Neighborhood Development Program

| | |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Hunters Point | 6,600,000 |
| Sacramento-Stockton | 1,300,000 |

4. Urban Beautification

| | |
|------------|---------|
| Open Space | 142,532 |
|------------|---------|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| 5. Neighborhood Facilities | -0- |
|----------------------------|-----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| 6. Federally Assisted Code Enforcement (FACE) | -0- |
|---|-----|

| | |
|--------------------|-----|
| 7. Water and Sewer | -0- |
|--------------------|-----|

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

(Estimated Annual Subsidy)

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Section 236 Housing | 4,434,534 |
|------------------------|-----------|

| | |
|--------------|-----------|
| 2. 221(d)(3) | 2,576,900 |
|--------------|-----------|

| | |
|---|-----|
| 3. 221(d)(3) Below Market Interest Rate | -0- |
|---|-----|

PUBLIC HOUSING

(Estimated Annual Subsidy)

| | |
|----------------------|-----------|
| 1. Public Housing | 5,338,759 |
| 2. Section 23 | 1,364,328 |
| 3. Operating Subsidy | 3,592,214 |
| 4. Modernization | -0- |

SUMMARY

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Comprehensive Planning Assistance | \$ 250,000 | |
| Community Development | 27,599,632 | |
| F.H.A. | 7,011,434 | |
| Public Housing | <u>10,295,301</u> | |
| TOTAL | | \$45,156,367 |

The Law Enforcement Assistance (LEA)

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice provided the City with a substantial amount of information on their program activity in San Francisco. Information on fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973 was provided as was information on the three major categories of LEA funds: block grant programs, discretionary programs, and National Institute Programs. In a cover memo the nature of each of these three categories was explained. Information on all programs included the following: federal program, funding agency, applicant, and federal share. Information on discretionary programs was more complete as project summaries were included for each San Francisco project. These summaries contained a full project description, effective dates of the project, and an indication of non-Federal funds.

The information received from the regional LEA office was forwarded to the Mayor's Criminal Justice Council for corroboration. An initial response indicated that the LEA information conformed to local records.

There were relatively few problems with the LEA data. Most of the programs appear to work on the basis of annual allocations that by and large conform to fiscal years. The approvals, at least for block grant programs, for the coming fiscal year are given sufficiently in advance to permit reasonably accurate reporting at an early date. Unlike HEW, accurate reporting does not await the completion of the fiscal year. If information like that contained in the project summaries for discretionary programs could be made available for all projects not covered by A-95 reviews, it would provide almost all information that would be required by a clearinghouse. The quantity of paper involved in such a process is a recognized problem, but these summaries are not substantially longer than A-95 review forms.

The City established the Mayor's Criminal Justice Council (CJC) which serves as the main link between the City and LEA. The CJC is also responsible for dealing directly with the California Council on Criminal Justice (CCCJ), the state agency responsible for distribution of LEA funds in California. Relations between the City and the CCCJ appear to be good.

Recommended Actions for Clearinghouse:

1. The CJC should work with both the State and Federal agencies to determine what, if any, modifications of their procedures would be required to establish a local review and comment system. It appears as though present procedures approximate a CERC process fairly closely.

2. The State and Federal agencies would be requested to provide the City with information on LEA programs not reviewed by the CJC at the earliest possible date and that the information be as complete as possible.

3. Copies of all relevant CJC documents summarizing LEA projects in San Francisco should be placed in a central clearinghouse file. Status reports of the current projects should also be kept in such a file, and the CJC should assist the clearinghouse to see that they are regularly updated.

SUMMARY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
IN
SAN FRANCISCO

Fiscal Year 1973

Block Grant Programs

| | | |
|--------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|
| SF YMCA | \$120,000 | |
| SFPD | 730,630 | |
| SF Delin Prev Comm | 52,001 | |
| SF DPH | 53,967 | |
| SF Superior Court | 38,500 | |
| SFPD | 181,934 | (appears to be a two-year grant) |
| SF Delin Prev Comm | 141,882 | |
| SFPD | 229,642 | |
| SF Delin Prev Comm | 74,873 | |
| " " " " | 72,021 | |
| SF County | 103,538 | |
| SF Juv Probation | 73,400 | |
| SF Sheriff | 31,764 | |
| SF DPH | 10,000 | |
| " " | 34,000 | |
| Reality House West | 39,150 | |
| sub-total | | \$1,879,302 |

Discretionary Programs

| | | |
|------------------|-----------|------------|
| SF City & County | \$ 48,000 | |
| SFPD | 126,500 | |
| sub-total | | \$ 175,000 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-------------|
| TOTAL | | \$2,054,302 |
|-------|--|-------------|

CHART E
SUMMARY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
IN
SAN FRANCISCO

Fiscal Year 1971

Block Grant Programs

| | | |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|
| SF YMCA | \$106,894 | |
| SF Delin Prev Comm | 104,510 | |
| SFPD | 30,000 | |
| sub-total | | \$241,404 |

Discretionary Programs

| | | |
|------------------|-----------|---------|
| SF City & County | \$ 41,711 | |
| SFPD | 250,000 | |
| sub-total | | 291,711 |

National Institute Programs

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------|-----------|
| Scientific Analysis Corp | 67,886 | |
| sub-total | | \$ 67,886 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-----------|
| TOTAL | | \$601,001 |
|-------|--|-----------|

Fiscal Year 1972

Block Grant Programs

| | | |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|
| SF YMCA | \$160,527 | |
| SFPD | 84,315 | |
| SF Delin Prev Comm | 222,650 | |
| SF DPH | 62,766 | |
| 7th Step Foundation | 43,551 | |
| SF Superior Court | 38,500 | |
| SF Del Prev Comm | 125,267 | |
| SFPD | 159,684 | |
| SF City & County | 28,100 | |
| " " | 9,858 | |
| " " | 7,091 | |
| sub-total | | \$942,309 |

| | | |
|-------|--|-----------|
| TOTAL | | \$942,309 |
|-------|--|-----------|

The Department of Labor (DOL)

By way of providing information on manpower programs in San Francisco, the Department of Labor (DOL) forwarded to the City, via the Federal Regional Council, a report prepared by the City. The report was prepared by the Mayor's Manpower Representative in April, 1972. No additional information was received from DOL itself. As the information that was received pertained to actual FY 1972 and projected FY 1973 data, the Mayor's Manpower Representative was asked for an update of the information. That material was received in mid-April 1973 and contained information on the recipient organization, the funding agency, and the amount of the federal grant. Additional information on some programs contained effective dates and an indication of non-Federal funds. All programs were broken down by whether or not they were subject to review by the local Manpower Planning Council (MPC).

The first apparent problem with this data is the dependence of the regional office of DOL on the local Manpower Representative for information. There are a large number of manpower programs, and there are four funding techniques:

- a. funds from the regional office to the community
- b. funds from the national office to the community
- c. funds from the national office to the state for state-run programs in the community
- d. funds from the national office to the state WIN program*

These differences have meant that the regional DOL offices are not always informed of actions taken by the national office and by state agencies. The regional office, consequently, does not have immediate access to information on all DOL activities within the region and therefore cannot supply it to local governments. San Francisco is fortunate to have a Manpower office that has consistently pursued information from a wide variety of sources on all manpower programs.

The information that is annually prepared by the Manpower Representative includes data on non-DOL manpower programs as well. In certain instances, such as HUD Model Cities projects and HEW-sponsored programs, there is some duplication between this data and that of the other agencies. The Department of Defense, the Veterans Administration, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs operate manpower programs. Obtaining hard data on these program expenditures in San Francisco appears to be almost impossible but the Mayor's Manpower Representative is aware of their existence and has attempted to assess their impact on the total manpower training efforts in San Francisco.

*The WIN program is designed to assist welfare recipients gain employment skills and is administered by the State Social Services agency.

Recommended Actions for Clearinghouse:

1. The City should continue to rely upon the Mayor's Manpower Representative for information on all manpower programs operating within San Francisco. The work of the Manpower Office should be coordinated with that of the Criminal Justice Council, the Office of Community Development and a local clearinghouse once it is operational. There are certain changes in the status of the Manpower office that may occur in the immediate future, which will make the office more directly responsible for DOL funds in San Francisco. Such a change should be encouraged.

2. The Department of Labor should be encouraged to make all DOL programs subject to review and comment by the Manpower Planning Council and/or the Mayor's Manpower Representative. This includes programs administered by the national office.

3. Copies of all relevant documents summarizing manpower projects in San Francisco should be placed in a central clearinghouse file. A format for the regular status reports should be developed for all manpower programs, and these should be maintained by the Manpower Representative with copies in the central file.

4. The City should require all public agencies applying for manpower funds to clear those proposals with the Manpower Planning Council at the earliest possible date.

CHART F

SUMMARY OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS IN SAN FRANCISCO

Fiscal Year 1973

Department of Labor

Regional Office - subject to CAMPS review

| | | |
|--|-------------|--|
| Bay Area Urban League | \$628,655 | (Three counties, S.F., Alameda, San Mateo) |
| Bayview-Hunters Point Affirmative Action Program | 83,938 | |
| CAMPS -- staff operations | 120,000 | |
| Concentrated Employment Program | 3,502,000 | |
| Human Rights Commission | | |
| Jobs in Action - Latin Americans | 50,000 | |
| Federal Skills Bank Program | 20,000 | |
| Jobs Optional | 255,830 | |
| MDTA Individual Referral | | |
| MDTA Skills Center | 1,713,361 | |
| NYC In-School | 274,000 | |
| S. F. Unified School District | 306,786 | |
| Horizons Unlimited | 56,295 | |
| NYC Out-of-School | | |
| Youth for Service | 562,000 | |
| Opportunities Industrialization Center | 168,000 | |
| Project SER - Jobs for Progress | 304,372 | |
| Summer Work Program | | |
| Sub-total | \$8,045,557 | (Including three-County grant) |

National Office - not subject to CAMPS review

| | | |
|---|-------------|--|
| Apprenticeship Opportunities Foundation | 137,620* | |
| Associated General Contractors of America | 108,256 | |
| Emergency Employment Act | 6,952,500 | |
| HRD Institute | NA | |
| NAB/JOBS | 875,000 | |
| Senior Community Service Project | 150,000 | |
| Work Incentive Program | 990,000 | |
| Job Corps Residential Center | 241,500* | |
| Job Corps YWCA | 156,000* | |
| Sub-total | \$9,610,876 | |

*Estimates

SUMMARY OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS IN SAN FRANCISCO (Cont.)

| Fiscal Year 1973 | <u>Current Budget</u> |
|--|-----------------------|
| <u>Non-Department of Labor - subject to CAMPS review</u> | |
| National Institute of Mental Health - HEW | |
| Public Service Careers | \$ 70,000 |
| Mental Health New Careers | 133,133 |
| U.S. Civil Service Commission | |
| Intergovernmental Personnel Act | 72,149 |
| <u>Office of the Mayor - Model Cities</u> | |
| <u>Referral and Follow-up - OBECA/</u> | |
| <u>Arriba Juntos</u> | 186,500** |
| Language Center - Mission Language | |
| & vocational school | 315,505** |
| <u>Employment Center - Mission</u> | |
| Community Hiring Hall | 101,062** |
| Minority Contractors Program - | |
| Minority Contractors Ass'n | 150,000** |
| Supplemental Legal Services - S.F. | |
| Neighborhood Legal Assistance | |
| Foundation | 50,919** |
| Manpower Skills Center (AOF) | 50,000** |
| Pre-Apprenticeship Training Program | 51,000** |
| (AOF) | |
| Clean-up Project - Apprenticeship | |
| Opportunities Foundation (AOF) | 42,000** |
| California Department of Social Welfare-HEW | |
| Education, Training & Rehabilitation | |
| Services - S.F. DSS | 215,000 |
| California Department of Education-HEW | |
| Adult Basic Education - S.F. | |
| Community College | 1,900,000 |
| Vocational Education - S.F. | |
| Community College | 564,578 |
| Occupational Education - S.F. | |
| Unified School District | 3,430,715 |
| California Department of Rehabilitation- | |
| HEW | |
| Harbor Light Alcohol Project - | |
| Salvation Army | 62,500 |
| Charila Foundation | 10,485 |
| S.F. Community Rehabilitation | |
| Workshop | 125,000 |
| S.F. Community Rehabilitation | |
| Workshop | 58,000 |

**FY'73 funds will be carried forward to FY'74 services. Funds are HUD money.

SUMMARY OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS IN SAN FRANCISCO (Cont.)

| Fiscal Year 1973 | <u>Current Budget</u> | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Non-Department of Labor (Cont.)</u> | | |
| Vocational Rehabilitation Service-HEW | | |
| Voc. Rehabilitation Services - | | |
| State Dept. of Rehabilitation | 825,000 | |
| Golden Gate Regional Center for | | |
| Mentally Retarded | | |
| Sheltered Workshop - S.F. Community | | |
| Rehabilitation Workshop | 20,400 | |
| Department of Social Services | | |
| City of San Francisco | | |
| Clerical Cluster Program - | | |
| California State University | 76,000 | |
| S.F. Community Rehabilitation | | |
| Workshop | 26,675 | |
| Adult Vocational Program - Aid to | | |
| Retarded Children | 56,523 | Sub-Total \$8,593,144 |
| | Total | \$26,249,577 |
| <u>Non-Department of Labor - not subject to CAMPS review</u> | | |
| Bureau of Indian Affairs | | |
| Veterans Educational and Training Assistance | | |
| Project Transition | | |

The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO)

The regional office of OEO provided the City with information on their programs for fiscal years 1972 and 1973. The information was reasonably complete, giving details on project description, funding agency, applicant, effective dates, and the federal share. All grants appear to be one-year allocations, although the information did note that San Francisco received part of its FY 1973 operating budget in the FY 1972 allocation. No breakdown of money was provided as to how the Economic Opportunity Council allocated funds to local activities. In certain cases it was impossible to determine if all programs listed by OEO provided services exclusively to San Francisco. Some appeared to have a broader service area.

In general the OEO funding procedures lent themselves nicely to the initial inquiry; the regional office maintains rather complete information on all annual basis and was able to give figures on FY 1973 allocations midway through the fiscal year.

At the present time it appears as though OEO as a separate bureaucratic entity is likely to be eliminated. It therefore makes little sense to speculate on how the City could develop a review and comment procedure with OEO. A description of problems in the data and recommended actions for a clearinghouse as pertain to OEO consequently are not included.

CHART G

SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS IN SAN FRANCISCO

Fiscal Year 1972

| | | | |
|---|----|------------|--------------|
| Region 9 American Indian Council | \$ | 80,000 | |
| Legal Aid Society | | 42,000 | |
| SF Unified School District | | 53,025 | |
| Western Regional Citizen Participation Council | | 51,000 | |
| Western Conference Council of State Government | | 13,000 | |
| California Rural Legal Assistance | | 2,655,753 | |
| EOC | | 8,948,091* | |
| TOTAL | | | \$11,842,869 |

Fiscal Year 1973

| | | | |
|--|----|------------|--------------|
| State Bar of California | \$ | 172,315 | |
| Legal Aid Society | | 82,099 | |
| CA Commission on Regional Medical Programs | | 12,375 | |
| Western Regional Citizens Participation Council | | 32,500 | |
| CA Rural Legal Assistance | | 1,884,100 | |
| EOC | | 2,012,273 | |
| | | 3,625,000* | |
| TOTAL | | | \$ 7,820,662 |

*In FY 1972 the EOC received \$8.9 million for FY 72 operations and \$3.6 million for FY 73 operations. If totals were to reflect Federal funds coming into the City during a given year the FY 72 total would be \$15,467,869 and the FY 73 total would be \$4,195,662.

The Department of Transportation (DOT)

The Department of Transportation (DOT) provided the City with a substantial amount of information. The department provided a copy of their computer run of all programs in San Francisco and amended that a few weeks later with information from the Federal Aviation Administration that was not included on the computer run. The computer run contained information on project description, funding agency, federal program, applicant, effective date, federal grant, and some indication of the current grant status. This information was informally checked by the Department of City Planning staff and appeared to be consistent with their information. The print-out contained one error: one project was listed both as an application and as an awarded grant.

Transportation projects by and large require several years to complete. Fiscal year information is therefore difficult to assemble. The computer print-out we received contained information on all projects from January 1, 1969. Many projects awarded during 1969 and 1970 are still underway, but specific data on the amounts of money expended during any given fiscal year was impossible to determine from the data available unless the project was completed during that same year. Information on the anticipated duration projects was not included. No data on local or state shares was available. It appears from the print-out that it might be possible to request print-outs using different formats.

Recommended Actions for Clearinghouse:

1. The possibility of a local review and comment system should be explored with the Department of Transportation. These conversations should eventually include the Departments of Public Works and City Planning, the Public Utilities Commission and the Airport Commission at the local level and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) at the regional level. At the present time MTC has considerable influence over the awards of at least certain transportation grants in San Francisco. Along with a review and comment process, the City should maintain continuing liaison with MTC on the development of transportation policy for the region and the maintenance of current data.
2. A Transportation Policy Group (TPG) presently exists to provide a central decision-making point for transportation issues and to develop a comprehensive strategy for implementing the long-range transportation goals and objectives of the City. The work of the Transportation Policy Group should be coordinated with that of a local clearinghouse, and it should receive all information pertaining to decisions of the Transportation Policy Group on programs and policy objectives. The TPG and clearinghouse should also receive regular information about anticipated transportation revenues and expenditures from DOT.

3. Once clearinghouse staff is available, status reports on all transportation projects within San Francisco should be prepared and kept in a central file. Procedures for regularly receiving and maintaining status reports should be established with all local transportation agencies in cooperation with staff assigned to the Transportation Policy Group. A recognized problem in establishing these procedures is the large number of transportation agencies operating within San Francisco.

CHART H

SUMMARY OF TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS IN SAN FRANCISCO
-- from January 1, 1969

| | <u>CLOSED</u> | <u>CURRENT</u> | <u>APPLICATION</u> |
|--|---------------|----------------|--------------------|
| <u>BART</u> | | | |
| | \$20,013,974 | \$70,510,333 | |
| <u>A-C Transit</u> | | | |
| | \$199,633 | | |
| <u>Golden Gate Trans & Bridge</u> | | | |
| | | \$8,031,028 | |
| <u>San Francisco City & County</u> | | | |
| | \$465,009 | \$51,547,742 | \$20,880,000 |
| <u>MTC</u> | | | |
| | | \$3,600,000 | |
| <u>Other (Including Calif PUC)</u> | | | |
| | \$17,359 | \$2,318,788 | |
| <u>Division of Highways</u> | | | |
| | \$36,458 | \$38,171,949 | |
| <u>San Francisco Airport</u> | | | |
| | | \$560,217 | |
| TOTALS | \$20,732,433 | \$174,790,057 | \$20,880,000 |

SUMMARY OF TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS FOR WHICH SAN FRANCISCO IS PRIME
SPONSOR SINCE JANUARY 1, 1969

- * APPLICATION (Jan 1971) Study of Kinetic Wheel as Trolley
Alternative Power \$880,000 UMTA
- * CLOSED (Jan 1969) Test of Coordination of Local and Area
Rapid Transit \$338,766 UMTA
- * ACTIVE Test of GM EIP Kit on 4 Busses \$65,124 UMTA
- * CLOSED (March 1972) Purchase of 2-Way Radios \$126,243 UMTA
- * ACTIVE 400 Buses, 210 Electric Vehicles, 128 Other
\$31,764,617 UMTA
- * WITHDRAWN (Dec 1969) Construction Embarcadero Station Tunnel
\$25,000,000 UMTA
- * ACTIVE 6 Year Improvement Program for Cable Cars
\$19,718,000 UMTA
- * APPLICATION (Feb 1972) Transit Power Improvement Program
for MUNI \$20,000,000 UMTA
- * DISAPPROVED (March 1970) Major Transportation Planning Study
\$1,666,666 UMTA
- * ACTIVE Taxiways Improvements and Repairs \$885,413 FAA
- * ACTIVE Runway/Aprons/Lighting Improvement \$991,241 FAA
- * ACTIVE CAT Runway Lighting \$3,725,516 FAA

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In the process of analyzing available information on the flow of federal funds to San Francisco, certain recommendations have been made, others implied. The summary recommendations listed here are tentative; they are drawn from the body of this report and their implementation is dependent upon the City's decision to establish a clearinghouse operation. The specific recommendations included in the analysis of each federal agency's data are not repeated here.

Local Cooperation

For a clearinghouse for federal and state grant applications to function effectively, good working relationships must be established between the clearinghouse and City agencies participating in federal grant activity. The maintenance of data by the clearinghouse on existing federally-assisted projects in the City will be dependent largely upon the cooperation of local agencies. Data maintenance will be a major responsibility of the clearinghouse and will require substantial time, but it is only one of several responsibilities of the clearinghouse.

Federal Cooperation

Consistent with the need for local cooperation, the City must continue to work with the Federal Regional Council and its member agencies to establish working agreements on a local review and comment system, a part of which will include regular reporting of data on federal grant applications and awards. The Federal Regional Council itself can play an important role in assisting cities like San Francisco in establishing local review and comment systems by taking the lead on behalf of its member agencies. In terms of information on the flow of funds the Council should consider the following:

- a. encouraging all member agencies to prepare at least quarterly reports on all funding activities in the region
- b. encouraging greater uniformity in the data
- c. encouraging immediate notification of the local chief executive of all grant awards
- d. further expansion of grant applications to be subject to A-95 review.

At the present time there is no additional HUD funding for expansion of the Planned Variations Chief Executive Review and Comment program. The Federal Regional Council can encourage its member agencies to enter into agreements with cities like San Francisco that are seeking such arrangements. The Council should further consider technical assistance to help setting up the specific procedures among the various agencies. The experience of HUD, in particular, in this process is an important resource.

Local Data Reporting

In San Francisco the Controller's Office maintains the most accurate data on the fiscal aspects of federal grants for which the City is prime sponsor. That information is presently in a form that makes it difficult to use. To make this data more available and readily usable, the following suggestions are made:

- a. federal and state grants should be isolated from other miscellaneous revenues and be given their own code number.*
- b. once a single code is established, a subgroup within it should be utilized for distinguishing grants in a way consistent with the organization of program offices within the Mayor's Office, e.g., manpower programs should have one designation, all community development programs should have another, criminal justice programs should have another, etc. Coding should also identify source of funds, such as HUD, HEW, etc.
- c. the potential for feeding information to the Controller's computer on the status of certain local grants, that are not a part of those records such as the Housing Authority, should be explored. This would permit a single print-out of all relevant City grant activity, irrespective of which agency maintains the official accounts.
- d. additional staff should be provided in the Controller's Office to complement staff of a clearinghouse. This staff should be solely responsible for federal and state grants and maintaining the computerized data on grant status.

Local Data Needs

It is likely that the City will keep different kinds of information on different kinds of grants. For example, the City should be aware of grants proposed by non-public agencies and have an opportunity to comment on them before final commitments are made. Once grants have been allocated to non-public agencies, the City should have that information on record and be able to check at the end of the grant period to update the information. For public agencies, however, the clearinghouse should have more complete data in the first instance and should maintain a regular update of the data, noting expenditures and encumbrances over time.

For those programs for which City agencies are prime contractors, the following information should be maintained from as early a point as possible:

1. Program Description: A short description of the purpose and operations of the program should be prepared. This should detail the activities of the program, the client(s), how this program is designed to meet City policies, and the anticipated benefits of the program.

*This action was taken on July 1, 1973.

2. Funding Agency: The Federal department (e.g., Department of Labor) and appropriate sub-department, agency or bureau should be specified.
3. Federal/State Program: The Federal or State program (e.g., Manpower Development and Training Act) should be specified.
4. Applicant: The name of the local agency or department requesting the grant should be specified.
5. Effective Date/Concluding Date: Dates should be provided of the estimated starting and concluding dates of the program. The effective date of the contract, if different from the first day of real work should also be noted.
6. Federal Share: The amount of money being provided by a Federal agency should be specified. Notations should be made of monies that are something other than a grant, such as a loan.
7. State Share: The amount of money being provided by a State agency should be specified. Notations should be made of monies that are something other than a grant, such as a loan.
8. Local Share: The amount of money being provided by a local agency should be specified. In-kind services or other non-monetary allocations should be noted.

The recommendations listed above apply to all federal agencies and relationships between the City and the Federal Regional Council. It is recognized that some will be more difficult to implement than others.

Local Pre-Application Review

One of the major purposes of a local clearinghouse is to perform a local review and comment on applications being made to federal and state agencies. This review covers applications made by both local public agencies and other agencies operating programs within the City, and is based on the assumption that if local governments are to take greater responsibility for federally funded activities they need to be in a position to review and to comment on applications in order to compare the objectives of the proposed programs to the objectives and goals of the City.

Local governments involved in the Chief Executive Review and Comment (CERC) System perform two kinds of reviews of applications: a policy review and an administrative review. The administrative review is related to applications from local public agencies. In these instances an application is reviewed to assure that all administrative requirements have been met, such as: is there sufficient local share available? are new job descriptions required?

are they being processed by Civil Service? will additional office space or new equipment be required? This procedure both assures that local public agency applications are adequately prepared and that City administrators are up to date on local grant activity.

Policy reviews of applications are somewhat more complex. Ideally, a city should know what its needs are and be in a position to seek federal and state assistance consistent with those needs. Too often, however, cities are forced to seek federal funds where they are available. In other words, cities' federally-funded activities generally reflect national funding priorities rather than local need priorities. The purpose of a local policy review is to more closely match local priorities with available federal and state funds. Applications from both local public agencies and other organizations are reviewed for their consistency with City policies.

Community groups are involved in the review of grant applications in the CERC system. They are asked to review applications that affect their neighborhood or area of special interest. Neighborhood groups receive all applications that would affect their neighborhood. Other special interest groups receive applications that fall into their area of interest or experience.

Once the various comments on an application have been made, they are forwarded to the clearinghouse which in turn forwards a composite comment to the funding agency. The clearinghouse does not edit comments, rather its responsibility is to make sure that all of the right persons have seen the application and that their comments are relayed back to the funding agency. In instances of conflicting comments, the clearinghouse should be able to convene the various local participants and representatives of the funding agency in the interest of working out a solution.

Pre-application review and comment procedures need to conform to existing patterns of responsibility and decision-making in a city, and San Francisco's unique governmental structure obviously will require local procedures that reflect that structure rather than structures devised elsewhere.

The Federal Regional Council is seen as a unique resource in being able to spearhead coordinative efforts in developing systems of local review and comment. If the Council chooses to take a more active role in providing flexible assistance, both financial and technical, to localities, the kind of local coordination that a clearinghouse makes possible will be expedited and eventually made more effective.

####

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY
JUL 15 1964
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C123307473

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

'JUL 15 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

